



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,251	11/01/2001	Robert K. Naviaux	UCSD1140-1	9760
	7590 11/14/2008		EXAMINER	
LISA A. HAILE, PH.D. GRAY CARY WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP 4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE, STE 1100 SAN DIEGO, CA 92121-2133			SPIVACK, PHYLLIS G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 1614

Applicant's Amendment filed August 7, 2008 is acknowledged. Claims 1-66, 68-73, 82, 83, 92-94, 112,113 and 146-180 are, or previously were, canceled. Claims 67, 74-81, 84-91, 95-111 and 114-145 remain under consideration.

The rejection set forth in the last Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is withdrawn. The following rejections are the only rejections presently applied to the instant claims.

Claims 67, 74-81, 84-91, 111 and 114-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation "with further proviso that the mitochondrial disorder is selected from the group consisting of: a primary disorder caused by at least one mutation in mitochondrial or nuclear DNA; and a secondary disorder caused by acquired somatic mutations, physiologic effects of drugs, viruses or environmental toxins that inhibit mitochondrial function" does not find clear antecedent basis in the specification as filed. Accordingly, the limitation added to instant claims 67, 91, 111 and 129 introduces new matter. See *In re Rasmussen*, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981).

In the last Office Action claims 67, 70, 73-81, 84-91, 96-109 and 111-179 remained rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Nagley et al., U.S. Patent 5,981,601, in view of Page et al., Proc. National Academy of Sciences. It was asserted Nagley teaches the administration of uridine, including functional derivatives and/or

Art Unit: 1614

precursors thereof, to treat mitochondrial disorders wherein at least one mutation in the mitochondria has occurred. Primarily, Nagley's teaching is drawn to the mitochondrial toxicity and physiologic effects that result from the administration of the reverse transcriptase inhibitor drug AZT. See claims 1, 5, 6, 10 and 18, column 18-20 and 24. AZT acts as a mitochondrial poison in that it causes cellular cytotoxicity, which is particularly manifest in muscle, causing myopathy. As a mitochondrial poison, AZT disrupts mitochondrial respiratory chain function resulting in a reduced capacity for generating ATP. Specifically, AZT affects the oxidation/phosphorylation system and the activity of complex I and IV of the mitochondrial respiratory chain. As required by instant claims 85, 86, 104 and 105, the administration of uridine may be accompanied by the administration of one or more co-factors or vitamins, such as coenzyme Q or an antioxidant as ascorbic acid. See Example 1, column 11. See column 5, lines 50-55, where Nagley's claimed redox compounds may include vitamins of the K series or ascorbic acid. See column 3, lines 50-60. Anti-oxidant scavengers include α -lipoic acid, as recited in instant claims 87 and 106. Further, other diseases associated with disruption of the mitochondrial respiratory chain function are also included in Nagley's teaching. See column 8, line 63, to column 9, line 10, where encephalomyopathy lactic acidosis is included among those mitochondrial pathologies contemplated. As required by instant claims 88, 89, 107 and 108, see column 7, lines 3-5, where the disclosed daily dosage range overlaps with those instantly claimed. The claimed recitation "about 2 gm/m² overlaps with Nagley's teaching of 2000 mg per day.

Applicant argues even though a broad latitude in reading claims is allowed, the claims have been read too broadly in that the current disclosure has nothing to do with AZT or other kinds of therapeutics. Applicant urges further that amended claims 67, 91, 111 and 129 now recite the closed language “consisted of.”

In fact, independent claims 67, 91 and 95 still recite the closed language “comprising.”

In response to Applicant’s assertion drawn to too broad an interpretation, a reference may be applied not only for what it expressly teaches by direct anticipation, but also for what one of ordinary skill in the art might reasonably infer from the teachings. See *In re Opprecht*, 12 USPQ 2d, 1235, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1976).

In light of the foregoing, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The rejection of record under 35 U.S.C. 103 is maintained over claims 67, 74-81 and 84-91 for the reasons of record. AZT is a mitochondrial poison, a reverse transcriptase inhibitor and a pharmaceutical agent that is encompassed in the claimed subject matter.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Final Action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this Action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this Final Action and the Advisory Action is not

Art Unit: 1614

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the Advisory Action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the Advisory Action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this Final Action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Phyllis G. Spivack whose telephone number is 571-272-0585. The Examiner can normally be reached from 10:30 to 7 PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful after one business day, the Examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, can be reached 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 8, 2008

/Phyllis G. Spivack/

Application/Control Number: 09/889,251
Art Unit: 1614

Page 6

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1614